

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXI, 1. WHOLE NO. 81.

I.—INDO-IRANIAN STUDIES.

I. a) *Ancient Persian Sibilants;*
b) *Inflection;*
c) *Translation of Behistān*, i.

PHONOLOGY.

The Ancient Persian Representation of s, z, and sp.

General literature.—Brugmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik, I² 728–739, 790–792; Bartholomae, Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, I 16–18, 165 seq., 187 seq.; Hübschmann, '*g'*, *gh'* im sanskrit und iranischen,' KZ. XXIII 384–400 (for the Anc. Pers., 395–398); Persische Studien, 198–214, 220–224; Foy, 'Die indg. gutturalen spiranten im Altpersischen,' KZ. XXXV 15–29.

The inscriptions of the Anc. Pers. show a rather frequent confusion in their employment of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. An attempt is here made to decide whether this confusion is due to dialectic differences or to a phonetic coincidence in the Anc. Pers. of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. The material offered by the inscriptions has been given as completely as possible, and it has been done independently either of Hübschmann or of Foy, to both of whom, however, I have been frequently indebted otherwise, as will appear in my citations below. The somewhat analogous case of the representation in Anc. Pers. of Iranian *sp* by *sp* or *s* also calls for attention, and it may be most conveniently discussed after a treatment of *s* and *z*.

A. *s and θ.*

Literature.—Sievers, Grundzüge der Phonetik[4], 119 seq.; Braune, IF. IV 341 seqq.; in Sanskrit: Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, I 239–242; in younger Avesta (not common): Jackson, Avesta Grammar, 29; Caland, KZ. XXXIII 463 seq.; in Lakonic: Meyer, Griechische Grammatik[3], 289 seq.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions with regard to *s* and *θ* is as follows:

1. *s. ayasatā* [cf. under Bh. i. §12], *aruvastam* [NRb. 4], *ardastāna, asman, asti, isu* [WB. *išu*, cf. Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq.], *upastā, usatašana, √xšnās, gastā, √tars, θastanaiy, dāsyaman* [WB. *dārayątā*; Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq., *dāsyamā*], *nisāya, √pars, pasā, pasāva, pārsa, pisā, basta, √ras, rāsta, vaumisa, vasiy, saka, skųka, √san* [doubtful; WB. substitute for its occurrences (Bh. iv. 71, 73, 77) *√kan*], *√sar* [Bh. iii. 91. This is the reading of Rawlinson and Spiegel; WB. *ākariyątām*], *sar*[*ā*] [? see Jackson, JAOS. XX 55], *sikayauvati, suguda, sugda, skudra, √star* [?], *√stā, stānam, sparda* [or *saparda*; cf. on this word below].

2. *θ. aθągaina, aθiy* [WB. rightly *abiy* in Bh. i. 91], *aθiyābaušana, aθura, amuθa, avaθā, xšāyaθiya, gaiθā, gāθu, θuvam, θaigrači* [so after Justi, ZDMG. LI 242 seq.], *θakatā, θatagu, √θad, √θah, θuxra, θuravāhara, θarda, niyaθ'ārayam, duvarθi, paθi, parθava, maθišta, yaθā, viθ, viθa, viθiya.*

Discussion.—Aside from combinations of consonants, where *s* is invariably written, we have the following classification of the material just collected:

1. a. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *sk̂(h)* in *ayasatā* [see under Bh. i. §12], *√xšnās, √ras*, and according to a verbal suggestion of Prof. Jackson in *sara-* NRa. 52, which he compares with Sk. *chala* (cf. Gk. σκολιός, Lat. *scelus*, and for the phonology Jackson, Av. Gramm. 49; Wackernagel, Altind. Gramm. I 155 seq.). Oppert, JA., 4 sér., XIX 168, suggested *saranā*, but he compared Sk. *śáraṇa* instead of *chalana*. [Professor Jackson's discussion of *sara* has now appeared in JAOS. XX 55.]

b. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *k̂* in *vasiy, asariyatā* [? cf. sup.].

c. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *k̂h* in *√san* [Bartholomae, KZ. XXVII 367; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 53 seq.].

d. *s* = Iran. *sč* in *pasā*, *pasāva* [cf. Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 50 f.; Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 209; also below under *sp*].

e. *s* = Iran. *θr* = Indog. *tr* in *vaumisa* [Hüsing, Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften, 13, 15, 18, 33]. Cf. also Ἀσιδάτης for **aθ'i*°, Justi, Iran. Namenb. 43.

f. *s* = Iran. *st* = Indog. *dt* in *usatašana* [WB. *ustašana*].

g. *s* = Iran. *š* in *isu* [WB. *išu*] (compare, however, Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq.).

h. *s* occurs in the foreign proper names *nisāya* [Median], *saka* [see Müller, WZKM. VII 258], *sikayauvati* [Hüsing, 27, reads *Sikayahvati*], *suguda*, *sugda*, *sparda* [Benfey and Rawlinson understood by this word Sparta; Spiegel, the Sepharad of Obadiah 20, which the Vulgate renders *in Bosphoro*. Lassen, ZKM. VI 50 referred to Σάρδεις <*σγαρδ°. This is well defended by Meyer, IF. I 326–329, who compares also the form Ξυάρις of Johann. Lydus, De mens. iii. 14; cf. also Müller, WZKM. II 93 seq., and Nöldeke, ibid. 92. This is the identification which I adopt. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 164, supposes Sparda to be "Lycie, conservée dans le grec Sarpedon," but Lewy, Semitische Fremdwörter im Griechischen, 193 seq., assigns a Semitic origin to Sarpedon].

i. *s* is of doubtful origin in the word *pisā*, which is of unknown signification (Bh. v. 25).

2. a. *θ* = Iran. *s* = Indog. $\hat{k}$ in *aθqgaina*, *θaigračī*, *θakatā*, √*θad*, √*θah*, *θuxra*, *θuravāhara*, *θarda*, *maθišta*, *viθ*, *viθiya*.

b. *θ* = Iran. *θ* = Indog. *th* in *amuθa*, *avaθā*, *xšāyaθiya*, *gaiθā*, *gāθu*, *θuvam*, *duvarθi*, *paθi*, *yaθā*.

c. *θ* = Iran. *sr* in *niyaθ'ārayam* [?].

d. *θ* = Iran. *s* in the foreign names *aθiyābaušana* [Hüsing, 20; Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, 50], *aθura*, *θatagu*.

e. *θ* = Iran. *θ* in *parθava*.

Results from the Anc. Persian.—Iranian *s* initially is in general represented by *θ*, excepting in the roots *sar* and *san* (both rather doubtful). Again, *s* arising from $\hat{k}$ is retained before *i* only in *vasiy* in contrast with *maθišta* and *viθiya*. But this double rendering of *s* before *i* is in itself a confirmation of our right to assume a like mutual interchange of *s* and *θ* before *a* [against this view Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 209]. An additional example of

s before *a* is *āyasatā*, if Bartholomae's reading [Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 75] be adopted. In the foreign name *θatagu* the single change of initial *s* is also to be remarked.

s arising from *sč*, *dt*, or *š* never interchanges with *θ*.

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.—Instructive in this connection is the comparison of Anc. Pers. *θaigračī* = New Sus. *Saikurričīš* with Anc. Pers. *θuxra* = New Sus. *Tukkurra* (but Babylon. *Suḫra*) and Anc. Pers. *θuravāhara* = N. Sus. *Tormar*. The equivalents of Anc. Pers. *θatagu* and *aθura* are, on the other hand, in New Sus. *Sattakuš* and *Aššuran*, and in Babylon. *Sattagušu* and *Aššur*.

(For final results see below.)

B. *z and d.*

Literature.—In addition to the literature cited above, Hüsing, Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften, 26, and for the analogous representation in Elean of *δ* = *ð* by *ζ*, Meyer, Griechische Grammatik[3], 269; Meister, Griechische Dialekte, II 52 seq.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions with regard to *z* and *d* is as follows:

1. z. *auramazdā*, *azdā*, [*iz*]*āva*, [WB. better [*hizuva*]*m*], *uvāra*[*zm*]*i*, *uvārazmiya*, *uzamayā*, *paruzana*, *paruv zana*, *paruvzana*, *vazraka* [or *vazarka*], *vahyazdāta*, *zarąka*, *zazāna*, *zura*, *zurakara*.

2. d. *āθ'iyādiya*, *ada*, *adakaiy*, *adam*, *adukani*, *apadāna*, *ayādana*, *arakadri*, *artavardiya*, *ardaxčašča* [corrupt form on Art. Vase], *ardastāna*, *ardumani*, *aršādā*, *avadā*, *ahifrastādiy* [loc. sg.; cf. on this word now Bartholomae, IF. IX 257–260], *idā*, *ụpadarąma* [so correctly read by Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 121; Hüsing, 14, 38, 43], *uvadaičaya* [Müller, WZKM. VII 256, keeps the old reading *uvadaidaya* and compares Anc. Pers. *didā* and its cognate words], *kąpada*, *gądutava*, *gądāra*, *garmapada*, √*gud*, √*jad*, *jadi*, *taxmaspāda*, *taradraya*, *tigraxauda*, *θarda*, *dauštar*, √*danu*, √*dar*, *draya*, √*darš*, *dasta*, *dašabāri* [? cf. under Bh. i. §18], *dahyu*, √*dā*, *dādarši*, *dāduhya*, *dārayavau*, *dāsyaman* [NRd. WB. *dārątā* (?); Justi, ZDMG. L 658, *dāsyamā*], *-dim*, √*di*, *didā*, *dipi*, *dubāla*, *dura*, √*duruj*,

duruva, duvaištam, duvarā, duvarθi, duvitātarnam, duvitiya, dušiyāra, drauga, draujana, drąga [WB. better *dargam*], *nadi̯tabira, nabukudračara, nipadiy, paišiyāuvādā, patipadam, √pā, bardiya, bāgayādi, frāda, marduniya, mudrāya, yadā, yadiy, avarada, rādiy, vardana, vidā, vidarna, vi̯dafrā, vi̯dafranā, sparda, hadā, hadiš, hąguda, haldita, hi̯du.*

Discussion.—These cases of *z* and *d* fall into the following classifications:

1. a. *z* = Iran. *z* in *auramazdā, azdā,* [*hizuva*]*m* [Spiegel [*iz*]*āva*], *uvāra*[*zm*]*i, uvārazmiya, uzamaya* [*z*+*d* giving *zz*, which is simplified to *z*], *paruzana, paruv zana, paruvzana, vazraka, vahyazdāta, zazāna, zura, zurakara.*

b. *z* = Iran. *d* in *zarąka.*

2. a. *d* = Iran. *d*(*h*) in *ada, adakaiy, adukani, ardastāna, ardumani, aršādā, avadā, azdā, ahifrastādiy, idā, u̯padarąma, uvadaičaya* [cf. above], *kąpada* [Hüsing, 38, *Kampanda*, after the New Sus. *Kampantaš*], *gądutava* [Justi, Grundriss der iran. Phil. II 430, to New Pers. كَنْدَم], *gądāra, garmapada, √jad, jadiy, taxmaspāda, tigrahauda, θarda, √danu, √dar, √darš, dahyu, √dā, dādarši, dārayavau, dāsyaman* [see above], *-dim, didiy, dipi, dubāla, duraiy, √duruj, duruva, duvaištam, duvarā, duvarθi, duvitātarnam, duvitiya, dušiyāra, drauga, draujana, dargam, nadi̯tibira, nabukudračara, nipadiy, paišiyāuvādā, patipadam, pādiy, frāda, mudrāya, rādiy, vardana, vidarna, vi̯dafrā, vi̯dafranā, sparda, hadā, hadiš, hąguda, haldita, hi̯du.*

b. *d* = Iran. *z* in *āθ*ʳ*iyādiya, adam, ayādana, artavardiya* [Justi, Iran. Namenb. 38], *√gud, taradraya, draya, dasta, adānā, dāduhya* [Babylonian *Zātu*], *√di* 'deprive,' *didā* [cf. New Pers. حز], *bardiya, bāgayādi, marduniya* [cf. Justi, Iran. Namenb. 195], *yadiy, avarada.*

c. *d* is of uncertain origin in *apadāna* [?], *arakadri* [probably for *d*, cf. the New Sus. *Arakkatarriš* and the Babylonian *Arakadri*], *dašabārim* [WB. *ušabārim*; Foy, KZ. XXXV 35 seq., reads *uštrabārim*; cf. below, §18], *yadā* [Bh. iii. 26 to *√yad* = Av. *yaz*; cf. Darmesteter, Étud. Iran. I 45, note. Foy, KZ. XXXV 43, emends *hačā ya*[*u*]*dāyā frarixta* "vom kriegszug zurückgelassen (d. i. zurückgeblieben)." I myself retain the old reading *yadā*], *vidā* [Bh. iv. 87—unintelligible].

Results from the Ancient Persian.—Ancient Persian *z* = Iran. *z* throughout except in *zarąka*, but Iran. *z* is represented more frequently in Anc. Pers. by *d* = *δ* [cf. Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 198 seq.]. Both *z* and *d* occur alike medially and finally, and no fixed law can be laid down concerning their interchange any more than concerning *s* and *θ*. It is to be noted that in all the modern Iranian dialects except New Persian, Iran. *z* becomes *d* only in loan-words from the Persian, *z* being in all other cases preserved [Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 221].

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.

1. a. Anc. Pers. *d* = Babylon. *z* in Anc. Pers. *Artavardiya* = Babylon. *Artavarziya*; Anc. Pers. *Dāduhya* = Babylon. *Zātu*, but New Sus. *Tattuhiya*; Anc. Pers. *Bardiya* = Babylon. *Barziya*, but New Sus. *Pirtiya.*

b. Anc. Pers. *d* = Babylon. *d* = New Sus. *t* in Anc. Pers. *dipi* = Babylon. *duppu* [a Semitic word] = New Sus. *tuppi.*

c. Anc. Pers. *d* = New Sus. *t* throughout (e. g. Anc. Pers. *Dubāla* = New Sus. *Tupala*, Anc. Pers. *dahyauš* = New Sus. *tayiyauš*), except in the case of *zana.*

2. a. Anc. Pers. *z* = Babylon. *z* = New Sus. *č*(*č*) in Anc. Pers. *Zarąka* = Babylon. *Zarangā* = New Sus. *Čaranka*(*š*), Anc. Pers. *Zazāna* = Babylon. *Zazannu* = New Sus. *Čaččan.*

b. Anc. Pers. *z* = New Sus. *t* only in *zazānam* = New Sus. *tanaš-pe-na*, Xerx. Pers. ca 7, and in the other occurrences of *zana* (Dar. Pers. a 3–4, NRa. 8, Dar. Elv. 14, Xerx. Pers. a 7, ca 7, Van. 12). [Cf. on *zana* now Remy, JAOS. XX 70. The Ancient Persian word has been borrowed in Biblical Aramaic זנא and in Syriac *znā*.]

(For final result see below.)

C. *sp.*

Literature.—Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 29 seq., and the authors there quoted; Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 178; Foy, KZ. XXXV 19 seq.; Hüsing, Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften, 24–26.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions for the double representation in Anc. Pers. by *sp* and *s* of Iranian *sp* = Indog. *ḱu̯* is as follows:

1. sp. *aspačanā, uvaspa, taxmaspāda, vayaspāra, vispazana, vištāspa,* σπακα [Median], Σπιθραδάτης.

2. s. *asagarta, asagartiya, asabāri, visa, visadahyu.*

Discussion.—These cases are sufficiently classified by the presentation of the material.

Results from the Ancient Persian.—The proper names in which *sp* is retained are usually explained as Median. With *visa* is compared Old Slavic *vĭsĭ* and Lithuanian *vìsas*, while *as^{a}b^{a}ari* is a case of haplology [further examples in Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. I^{2} 858]. Horn's explanation of *asabāri* as from **assa*° [Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, Nos. 160, 749] is rejected by Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 77, and by Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 29. Müller's connection, WZKM. VIII 182–183, of *asa* with ὠκύς is wrong. Notwithstanding this, I believe that Horn is right. We find precisely the same development in the Pāli-Prākrit *assa, vissa* for Skt. *aśva, viśva* = Av. *aspa, vispa.* But in Avestan *sp* can hardly become *s* as is suggested by Horn, No. 749, note, and by Hüsing, 25, for *Asabana* of Yašt, v. 73; xiii. 140 [the correct view is given by Justi, Iran. Namenb. 42].

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.

1. a. Anc. Pers. *sp* = New Sus. *šp* = Babylon. *sp* in Anc. Pers. *Aspačina* = New Sus. *Ašpačana* = Babylon. *Aspašina*; Anc. Pers. *Taxmaspāda* = New Sus. *Takmašpata*; Anc. Pers. *Vayaspāra* = New Sus. *Mišparra* = Babylon. *Visparū*; Anc. Pers. *Vispauzatiš* = New Sus. *Mišpaučatiš*; Anc. Pers. *Vištāspa* = New Sus. *Mištašpa* = Babylon. *Vistaspi*; Anc. Pers. *vispazana* = New Sus. *mišpazanaš* (Dar. Pers. a 3, where only the New Sus. text has this addition: 'of all nations').

b. Anc. Pers. *sp* = New Sus. *šš* in Anc. Pers. *vispazana* = New Sus. *mišša tanaš* (NRa. 8).

2. a. Anc. Pers. *s* < Iran. *sp* = New Sus. *šš* (= Babylon. *sk*!) in Anc. Pers. *Asagartiya* = New Sus. *Ašša kartiya* (= Babylon. *Iskartai*); Anc. Pers. *visadahyuš* = New Sus. *mišša tayihuš* (Xerx. Pers. a 11 f.).

(For final result see below.)

D. *Final Result.*

The confusion in Ancient Persian in the use of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*, is explained by Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 166, as due to dialect-mixture, and this theory has been carried still further by Hüsing (15, 23 seq.) on the basis of the representation by New Sus. *š*(*š*) of Anc. Pers. *θr*, *θr*, *t*(*a*)*r*, and *s*, and again by the New Sus. transcription with *t*+vowel+*r* of Anc. Pers. *θr* and *t*(*a*)*r*. The explanation by dialect-mixture is fatally easy, but the promiscuous use of forms of different dialects is hardly to be expected in an official language, such as that which is being considered—proper names, of course, excepted.

Conclusion.—Our conclusion, at least temporarily, is as follows:

For **A, B.** At a very early period in Persia, before the time of Darius, there had begun the process which resulted in the phonetic equivalence of *s* and *θ*, and similarly of *z* and *ð* (*d* in script) [similarly to be explained is the interchange of *s* and *θ* in Avesta and of such cases as the Av. *yezi* beside *yeδi*].[1] The consequence of this equivalence of sound, combined with a lack of etymological feeling, was the confusion of usage of the characters for *s* and *θ*, and for *z* and *d*, which we have observed.

For **C.** Simultaneously with the phenomena just discussed, there was in process of development another *s*, which arose from the assimilation of two juxtaposed consonants. Three such combinations will engage our attention here. One was, if our course of argument has been correct, *sp* which became *ss*, and is consequently written *s*. The second assimilation was that of Aryan *tr* which developed through the intermediate stage of Iran. *θr* to *s* in "the dialect with which the Elamites had most to do" [Hüsing, 15, 18].

The third assimilation is in *pasā*, *pasāva* from **pasča* (Av. *pasča*, *paskāṭ*; Sk. *paścā*, *paścāt*; Lithuan. *pāskui*) through the same medial stage *ss* [Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 50–51, does not favor this. Against his view see Foy, KZ. XXXV 22, 26, who also compares Sk. *acchā* from **at*

[1] As a similar phonetic development in an entirely different group of languages, I may cite the modern Persian and Egyptian pronunciation of the Arabic *ṯ* (þ) and *ḏ* (ð) as *s* and *z* respectively. As Avestan examples of an interchange between *s* and *θ* in late texts, I note from the variae lectiones of Vend. xix. *jasāhi* (§18) **Jp** 1, *s* also in **Mf** 2, **L** 1. 2. **Br** 1. **K** 10. **M** 2, but *jaθāi* **L** 4. **K** 1; *fraθō* (§19) beside *frasō* **K** 1. **L** 4; *pairiθnəm* (§28) **Jp** 1. **Mf** 2. **L** 1. 2, *pairisinəm* **K** 1, *pairišnəm* **L** 4. Numerous other cases might be given.

(cf. Lat. *ad*) +*cha*].[1] The only other combination of *s*+*č* in Anc. Pers. is *kaščiy*, where the feeling for the enclitic *-čiy* has prevented any assimilation (so also in the case of *š*<*ṯ* in *avaščiy*, *čišciy*, etc.).

This *s* arising from assimilation is never confused with Iran. *s* = Indog. *k̄*. In other words, it never approached the phonetic value *þ*.

We have sought to show that there is no law which determines when we shall find *s* and when *θ*, when *z* and when *d*, and also that this absence of rule is not due to any dialect-mixture or similar cause. There remains the explanation which we have endeavored to uphold: the phonetic equivalence and consequent confusion of usage of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. Attention has also been drawn to precisely similar phenomena presented by the Lakonic and Elean dialects of the Greek. Lastly, the degeneration of the old Iranian *s* toward the value *þ* receives an additional confirmation, when we note the sharp distinction in the case of *s* arising from assimilation which nowhere in the inscriptions interchanges with *θ*. Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 115, has called attention to the fact that of all the Iranian dialects only the Ancient Persian, with its successors the Middle and New Persian, shows this confusion in the usage of *s* and *θ*, of *z* and *d*.

[While the final proof of this paper is still in my hands, the valuable studies of Dr. Hüsing, 'Altiranische Mundarten, I' and 'Zur persischen Lautlehre,' KZ. XXXVI 556–571, have appeared. Despite the arguments by which he seeks to prove the existence of the six Ancient Iranian vernaculars which he calls the *missa-*, *mitara*, *miθ^ra-* [these three in the Anc. Pers. inscriptions in his view], *miθra-* [Avesta according to him], *mitr-*, and *mihr(a)*-dialects, I am unable as yet to find myself converted to his theory. His method of operating almost exclusively with proper names is not perhaps altogether invulnerable. I am, moreover, well aware of the fact that where the Anc., Middle, and Mod. Pers. have *d*, but the Avesta has *z*, the Afγān, Balūcī, Kurdish, Ossetish, and Persian dialects have *z* likewise [see now Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 2, 82–83, 90–91, 205, 209, 236, 258–259, 305, 352, 385, 414, and with regard to the problem of *s* and *θ*, ibid. 85–86, 93–94, 305, 352, 385]. I am still unwilling, notwithstanding this, to see in the official inscriptions of the Ancient Persian kings "eine

[1] In favor of the view here sustained I may now cite Bangalī *pāsā* 'after' beside *pāchā* from Skt. *paścā*. Grierson, ZDMG. L 25; cf. Bhandarkar, J. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. XVII 2, 173.

mischsprache aus zwei verschiedenen mundarten" (Hüsing, 562). I still hold to the explanation which I have suggested above for the varying usage in Anc. Pers. of *s* beside *θ*, and of *z* beside *d*—namely, to the hypothesis that these sounds *s* and *θ*, *z* and *d* had become in the Anc. Pers. phonetically equivalent.]

INFLECTION.

Nominative Singular of -as-Stems.

Literature.—Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 214 seq.

The solution of the Ancient Persian phrases such as xiv. *raučabiš θakatā āha* has been often tried. The word *θakatā* is generally considered now as the loc. sg. of an *-i*-stem [Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 227], but the old view that *raučabiš* is an instr. with comitative force is still held by Bartholomae, op. cit. 246, "Mit dem 14. Tage im Vjachna-Monat, in [dessen] Verlauf war es, als er sich auflehnte" (similarly Foy, KZ. XXXV 33, 68). To Prof. Jackson I owe the suggestion that *raučabiš* is the inst. pl. used as a general plural case, exactly as in Avestan [Jackson, Av. Gramm. 67; Schmidt, Pluralbildungen, 98 seqq., 259 seqq.; cf. also Bartholomae, Arische Forschungen, II 104. Foy's arguments, KZ. XXXIII 426–430, against any general plural case fail to convince me]. This would give the rendering: 'xiv days were in course.' On my attempt to explain similarly the difficult *viθibiš*, see under Bh. i. §14 [against this explanation both of *raučabiš* and *viθibiš*, Schmidt, Pluralb. 266 seq.].

This view of *raučabiš* leads of itself to a consideration of the similar phrase in Bh. iii. 8: *garmapadahya māhyā* i. *rauča θakatā āha* 'Of the month Garmapada one day was in course.' Here *rauča* is not an accusative, as Spiegel, Keilinschr.[2] 238, and Hübschmann, Casuslehre, 293, say, but the nom. sg. as subject of *āha*.

Another nominative of the *-as*-stems is found in Sz. c 9: *hačā pirāva nāma rauta tya mudrāyaiy danauvatiy* [Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 195, reads *danautiy*, *danutaiy*, or *danuvatiy* for this last word] 'From a river, Nile by name, which flows in Egypt.' Bang, ZDMG. XLIII 534, makes *rauta* the accusative after *hačā*, and he compares Bh. i. 50–51: *karāšim hačā daršam atarsa* 'The people were mightily afraid of him.' The explanation of Thumb, KZ. XXXII 129, by an anakoluthon

fails to observe the idiom of the language, and Foy's "compound," KZ. XXXV 32, is rather more artificial than necessary. The reading of Müller, WZKM. I 224, *haćā pirāva* [ablative = Av. **piraōṯ*] *nāma rautata*, need not be dwelt upon. The true explanation is that of Bartholomae, BB. XIV 249, who makes *rauta* the nominative and compares for the construction Bh. iii. 12–14: *pasāva adam frāišayam dādaršiš nāma pārsa mana bąḍaka baxtariyā xšaθapāvā* 'Afterward I sent a Persian, Dādarši by name, my servant, satrap in Bactria,' also Bh. i. 36–37: *haćā paiši[yā]uvādāyā arakadriš nāma kaufa* 'From a hill, Arakadri by name, in Paišiyāuvāda' [cf. Hübschmann, Casusl. 289 seq.]. In the light of this Bartholomae's omission of any nom. sg. of the *-as*-stems in the Grundriss der iran. Philol. must be an oversight.

TRANSLATION.

Behistān, i.

§1, *lines 1–3.* I am Darius, the great king, king of kings, king in Persia, king of lands, son of Hystaspes, grandson of Arsames, an Achaemenian.

§2, *lines 3–6.* Saith Darius the king: My father [was] Hystaspes. The father of Hystaspes [was] Arsames. The father of Arsames was Ariaramnes. The father of Ariaramnes [was] [Teïspes]. The father of Teïspes was Achaemenes.

§3, *lines 6–8.* Saith Darius the king: Therefore we are called Achaemenians. From aforetime we have been tested. From aforetime our house hath been kings.

§4, *lines 8–11.* Saith Darius the king: Eight of my house, they were kings before. I am the ninth. Nine from days of old we are kings.

§5, *lines 11–12.* Saith Darius the king: By the grace of Ormazd I am king. Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom.

§6, *lines 12–17.* Saith Darius the king: These lands, they came unto me. By the grace of Ormazd I am their king: Persia, Susiana, Babylon, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, those of the sea, Sparda [Sardis?], Ionia, Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara [Kandahar? Oppert], Scythia, Sattygia, Arachosia, Maka [Mekran?] —altogether twenty-three lands.

§7, *lines 17–20.* Saith Darius the king: These lands, they came unto me. By the grace of Ormazd they were my subjects. They brought me tribute. What was said unto them by me either by night or day, that they did.

§8, *lines 20–24.* Saith Darius the king: Within these lands the man who was a friend, I treated him well. Who was a foe, I administered a good inquisition to him. By the grace of Ormazd these lands obeyed what [were] my laws. As it was proclaimed by me unto them, so they did.

tyanā: Benfey, Pers. Keilinschr. 9; Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70; and Foy, KZ. XXXV 45, Anm., think that it has received its *-nā* from the following *manā* by dittography, but this fails to explain fully the *-ă-*. The majority, as Oppert, JA., 4. sér., XVII 287; Hübschmann, Casusl. 298; Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 236 (hesitatingly); and Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. II 782, regard this word as an instr. (cf. Av. *ka-na* beside *kā*, Skt. *kē-na*, *tē-na*, *ē-na*). Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 227 seq., made it an abl. Müller's attempt in WZKM. VII 112 to explain the *-n-* as for an *-hm-* arising from *-sm-* fails to convince me (cf. Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 166, 169, 237). I must give my adherence to the rendering of Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70: "diese länder, was meine gesetze sind, die ehrten sie" (for similar cases of *tya* standing alone as a compound relative see Bh. iv. 42, 49, 53; Xerx. Pers. b 30, da [db] 19, Art. a 35; cf. also Xerx. Pers. a 19–20, ca [cb] 13–14). This rendering agrees very closely with the Babylonian text (the New Susian version here is lost), *dênâtu attûà ina birît mâtâti agânêtu ušazkû* (?) 'these laws were fulfilled (?) within these lands (cf. Bezold's text and translation). My only suggestion is to regard the *n* in *tyanā* not as a dittography, but as an analogical formation after the instrumental. Other instances of a similar insertion of *n* through false analogy are not lacking in Iranian pronouns. An Avestan case in point is *činəm* beside the regular *kəm*, *čim* 'whom?' and for the Old Persian we may cite the troublesome *yanaiy* C 22 (Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 236–237). Müller's explanation of *yanaiy*, WZKM. XII 76–77, is unsatisfactory. The third instance of the analogical use of *n* is in the word *aniyanā*, Dar. Pers. d 11, e 20. This is, as Spiegel (and Foy, KZ. XXXV 10; 52) have rightly seen, an ablative which has fallen together in form with

the instrumental on account of the loss of the final *-t*. These parallel cases, *činəm*, *yanaiy*, and *aniyanā* would seem to favor my view that *tyanā* also is an instance of false analogy after the instrumental singular rather than a dittography arising from the final *-nā* of the following word *manā*.

§**9**, *lines 24–26*. Saith Darius the king: Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom. Ormazd brought me help until this kingdom was held. By the grace of Ormazd I hold this kingdom.

§**10**, *lines 26–35*. Saith Darius the king: This [is] what was done by me after that I became king. One Cambyses by name, the son of Cyrus, of our house, was king here before. Of that Cambyses there was a brother, Bardiya by name, having the same mother and the same father as Cambyses. Afterward Cambyses killed that Bardiya. When Cambyses killed Bardiya, the people had no knowledge that Bardiya was killed. Afterward Cambyses went to Egypt. When Cambyses went to Egypt, then the people became hostile. Then the Lie waxed at will in the land, both in Persia, and in Media, and in the other lands.

azdā: Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 143 (cf. now IF. IX 279–281), considers *azdā* to be the locative singular of an *i*-stem used adverbially (on the syntax cf. Delbrück, Altind. Synt. 202 seq.). Johansson, IF. II 28, with whom I agree, regards Anc. Pers. *azdā* as a noun in the nom.

avajata: For my reading, with correction of the stone, of *avājata* (i. e. $\sqrt{}jan+ava+ā$ as in all other cases of *avāj*°) see Rawlinson's lithograph of Bh. i. 32: $av^{a}{}_{\text{letter}}^{\text{no}}\, j^{a}t^{a}$. This gap I would fill with *a*.

§**11**, *lines 35–43*. Saith Darius the king: Afterward there was a man, a Magian, Gaumāta by name. He arose from a hill, Arakadri by name, in Paišiyauvādā, [yea, even] from there. Of the month Viyaxna fourteen days were in course when he arose. He thus lied unto the people: I am Bardiya, the son of Cyrus, the brother of Cambyses. Afterward the people all became confederate from Cambyses. They went over to that man, both Persia, and Media, and the other lands. He seized the kingdom. Of the month Garmapada nine days were in course. Then he seized the kingdom. Afterward Cambyses died by his own hand.

māhyā: Bartholomae, BB. IX 309 seq., Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 215; Horn, 'Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie,' No. 968; Foy, KZ. XXXV 5, take this as the loc. sg. of *māh* [Av.

māh, Skt. *mās*] + *ā*. It is, however, far better to return to the old view and to consider *māhyā* as standing for the genitive *māhahya* from *māha* [Av. *må̊ŋha*, Skt. *māsa*]. The material offered by the inscriptions for the retention or omission of *h* = Indog. *s* in the Anc. Pers. combination *-ăhă-* is as follows [for Avesta examples see Jackson, Av. Gramm. 102, 131, 148, 154]:

1. *h* is retained: *auramazdāhă*, *anahata*, *āvahanam*, *ahatiy*, *āham*, *āha*, *āhątā*, *parikarāhadiš* [WB. *parikarāh*[*i*]*diš*], *xšnās*-[*āhadiš*], *aθaham*, *aθaha*, *θuravāhara*, *nāha*, *fraharva*, *bagāha*, *patiyāvahaiy*, *vahauka*, *visanāhadiš* [WB. *vikanāh*[*i*]*diš*], *frāhąjam*.

2. *h* is omitted: *θāhy*, *θātiy*, *āpariyāya* [if it is to be connected with Skt. √*sap*, Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 85, 196; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70], *vivāna* [cf. Av. *vivaŋhå̊* and see Justi, Iran. Namenb. 374].

If *māhyā* were a locative, *Viyaxnahya* could only be an "appositional genitive," an explanation which does not appeal to me here. On the construction of *raučabiš* see above under the 'Nominative Singular of *-as*-Stems.'

§**12**, *lines 43–48*. Saith Darius the king: This kingdom of which Gaumāta the Magian deprived Cambyses, this kingdom from aforetime belonged to our house. Afterward Gaumāta the Magian deprived Cambyses both of Persia, and of Media, and of the other lands. He assumed [it = the kingdom (?) and] made [it] under his own dominion. He became king.

ayastā: Notwithstanding the criticisms of Foy, KZ. XXXV 33 seq., I have made the above rendering in full accord with Bartholomae, BB. XIV 246 seq. [cf. the same scholar, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 75], who compares for the single object of two verbs the following three passages: **a.** Bh. ii. 87–88: *kā*[*ra*] *hya manā . . . čiθ*ʳ*ątaxmam agarbāya anaya abiy mām* 'My army . . . seized, brought unto me Čiθʳantaxma.' **b.** Bh. iv. 42–43: *tya manā kartam varnavatām θuvām māt*[*ya duruxtam man*]*iyāhy* 'Let my deed [*or* what hath been done of me] seem true to thee, deem it not false' (*kartam* being the subject of *varnavatām* and the object of *man*]*iyāhy*). **c.** Bh. iv. 70–72: [*tu*]*vam kā hya aparam imām dipim vaināhy tyām adam niyapišam imaivā patikarā mātya vikanāhy yāvā ji*[*vāhy*] 'O thou who in time to come shalt behold this tablet which I have cut or these pictures, destroy [them] not so long as thou livest.' Foy's objections certainly fail in the case of **a**, even if we grant them in **b** and **c**.

Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 229 seq., and formerly Bartholomae, Handbuch, 209, regarded *ayastā* as the nom. of a noun in *-ar* governing the acc. as does *kāma* in Bh. iv. 35 and NRa. 38. Benfey, Pers. Keilinschr. 18, compared Sk. *āyatta* 'dependent upon' [similarly Hoffmann, BB. XVIII 285 seq., who construed *ayastā* as the instr. sg.]. The use of *āyasatā* [so to be read with Bartholomae instead of *ayastā*] is similar in Bh. iii. 4, 42. Perhaps one may compare also the asyndeton in such passages as Bh. iv. 57–58: *yadiy imām hąḍugām apagaudayāhy naiy θāh[y kārahyā Auramaz]dātay jatā biyā* 'if thou shalt conceal this inscription, not speak unto the people, may Ormazd slay thee.' It is also noteworthy that the New Susian renders *āyasatā* by the verb *emituš*, which is the regular translation of the Anc. Pers. root *di* 'deprive.' The Anc. Pers. *uvāipašiyam akutā* appears in New Susian as *tuman-e* 'zum Besitztum'; cf. Foy, ZDMG. LII 570, 564.

§13, *lines 48–61.* Saith Darius the king: There was not a man, either a Persian, or a Median, or any of our house, who would make Gaumāta the Magian deprived of his kingdom. The people were mightily afraid of him. "He would be killing at will the people that had known the former Bardiya." For this reason he would be killing the people: "That they may not know that I am not Bardiya, the son of Cyrus." No one dared to say aught concerning Gaumāta the Magian until I came. Afterward I implored Ormazd. Ormazd brought me help. Ten days of the month Bāgayādi were in course. Then I with a few men killed that Gaumāta the Magian and those men who were his foremost followers in a stronghold Sikayauvati by name in a land Nisaia by name in Media. There I killed him. I deprived him of the kingdom. By the grace of Ormazd I became king. Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom.

avājaniyā: An iterative optative from $\sqrt{jan}+ava+ā$ [cf. Stackelberg, Beiträge zur Syntax des Ossetischen, 77]. For similar phenomena in Avestan see Bartholomae, Altiran. Verb. 212, 216; KZ. XXVIII 37; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 127; Jackson, PAOS. XVII clxxxvii; and cf. Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. II 372 seq. The idea of Spiegel, Vergl. Gramm. 344, and of Foy, KZ. XXXV 34, that this word is an augmented optative, I can not accept.

§14, *lines 61–71.* Saith Darius the king: The kingdom that had been taken away from our house, that I established. I set it

in its place. As before, so I made the places of worship which Gaumāta the Magian had digged down. I restored to the people the servants (?), and the live-stock (?), and the real estate, and the private property (?) of which Gaumāta the Magian had deprived them. I set the people in their place, both Persia, and Media, and the other lands. As before, so I brought back what had been taken away. By the grace of Ormazd I did this. I toiled until I set our family in its place as before. So I toiled by the grace of Ormazd that Gaumāta the Magian did not take away our family.

niyaθ'ārayam: The Av. √*srār*+*ni* of Vd. xviii. 51: *imәm mē narәm nisrārayå* 'This man shalt thou restore to me' [similarly already Justi, Handb. der Zendspr. 307; cf. also Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 71]. Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. I² 856 seq., connects this √*srār* with the Av. *nis'rinao'ti* [see among other passages again Vd. xviii. 51, and cf. Sk. √*śri*, Gk. κλίνω, etc.], and he thus supposes a progressive disappearance of the spirant.

abicariš: The reading *abācariš* is adopted by Spiegel. This has been best defended by Darmesteter, Étud. Iran. II 129–131, who connects *abācariš* with the Sk. *sabhā* and the √*car*, its modern representative being the New Pers. بازار. Darmesteter's view is refuted by Horn, Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, No. 166, because of the Pahl. *vačār* 'bazaar' [cf. also Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 23]. Bartholomae's suggestion [apud Horn, loc. cit., and Grundriss der iran. Philol. II 149], *ąbācariš*, *aba'ačariš* 'aqueducts,' is not to be adopted on account of the sense. The same criticism must be made of the derivation by Müller, WZKM. IV 108, from **ăp-ačari*. Spiegel's translation 'Weideplätze' implies a connection with New Pers. جریدن 'to pasture' [see Horn, Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, No. 439]. He is followed by Rugarli, who renders *abicariš gaiθāmčā māniyamčā viθibiščā* by 'i pascoli, le campagne, le case, i vici.' The better reading *abičariš* is Rawlinson's, who is followed by WB.

The word *abičariš* also has been explained in several ways. Oppert, JA., 4. sér., XVII 404, 410, renders it 'en sauveur' [cf. the same scholar, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 167]. Bang, ZDMG. XLIII 527 seq., and IF. VIII 294, translates 'Hülfsmittel [zum Unterhalt].' This appeals to me no more than Foy's connection with √*bhā* 'shine' [ZDMG. L 132]. Both Rawlinson and Kern,

ZDMG. XXIII 235, appear to me to have come nearest the solution. For we must compare the Sk. *abhicara* 'servant, attendant,' and we must see in the word a neuter abstract of the *-iš-* stems like *hadiš* [Xerx. Pers. da [db] 16, Xerx. Pers. ca [cb] 11]. On this formation, which is especially close to and often interchanges with that in *-as*, see Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. II 398 seq.; for the Indo-Iranian, Schmidt, Pluralb. 378–387; for the Iranian, Spiegel, Vergl. Gramm. 175; Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 95–96; for the Avestan, Justi, Handb. der Zendspr. 370; Jackson, Av. Gramm. 102–103; for the Ancient Persian, Spiegel, Keilinschr.[2] 169; for the Sanskrit, Lindner, Altind. Nominalb. 60. Compare also the analogous use of Lat. *seruitium* = *seruos*, e. g. Tac. Ann. xii. 17: *seruitii decem milia offerebant*; Vell. Paterculus, ii. 82, 3: *calonum seruitiique desiderata tertia* [*pars*] *est*; and see Schmidt, Pluralb. 12–20.

Tolman's translation, Transact. Wisconsin Acad. VIII 244, by 'commerce' is not altogether bad. Foy, KZ. XXXV 35, is right in saying that the absence of *-čā* after *abičariš* does not militate against a syntactic equality with the following words. I must therefore differ for the present from Bang, Mélanges Charles de Harlez, 10.

māniyam: At first I connected this word, as does Foy, KZ. XXXV 73, with the √*man*, Gk. *μένω*, etc., but I now prefer the older and better comparison with YAv. *nmāna*, GAv. *dᵉmāna*, Gk. *δέμω*, etc. Bang's connection of Anc. Pers. *māniya* [ZDMG. XLIII 528] with Lat. *mānus*, √*mā* is less happy, and has been withdrawn by him [cf. Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 183]. Neither can I accept Oppert's translation [Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 119]: "Et je restituai, en faveur du peuple, et la croyance et la langue, et je rendis aux familles ce que Gomatès le Mage leur avait enlevé." Darmesteter, Étud. Iran. II 129–131, has compared with the *gaiθā* and *māniya* here the Avestan *gaēθa* and *vīs*. His rendering of the crux is: "(je rendis aussi) les marchés, les fermes et les maisons aux clans."

viθibiščā: The old rendering (e. g. in Spiegel, and retained by Schmidt, Pluralb. 266 seq., and by Justi, Grundriss der iran. Philol. II 426 seq.) 'according to clans' is not to be received, as Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 235, already saw. Little better is WB.'s 'in den Häusern (?).' Foy previously, in KZ. XXXIII 424–432, took *viθibiš* as a sociative inst. pl. m. 'with his clanmates.' His parallels were Bh. iv. 73–74 and Xerx. Pers. a 15, but the *-čā*

which he accepted [page 420] is against such an interpretation. Foy's later interpretation [ZDMG. L 134 seq.] as *viθbaiša* [cf. Rawlinson, JRAS., O. S. X xviii, on the doubtful reading of the ˇ] from *vi+baiša*^{h}, with a comparison of Av. *vīṯbaēšå̊*, Ved. *vidvēṣās*, to which he gives the meaning 'peace,' is well worthy of consideration, though a trifle abstract. Bartholomae, AF. II 104, struck the right note when he assumed that the word is used as the acc. pl. [Less good is his rendering, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 226, as an adverb, 'und überhaupt,' thus making it from *viθa* = Sk. *viśvá* (?).] My own explanation, at least temporarily, is that *viθibišča* is an inst. neut. pl. used as an accus. [cf. on *raučabiš* above under Inflection], and that it comes from a neut. sg. **viθin-*. If this be right, we are to compare for the meaning the gloss of Hesychios οἰκεία· ἰδία, and we see a climax of rapacity at the expense of the Persians, while indulgences were lavished on the other parts of the empire. From the Persians were snatched first the slaves, which could be most easily seized, and last of all even their personal effects. This may throw light on the words of Herodotos, iii. 67: ἀπεδέξατο ἐς τοὺς ὑπηκόους πάντας εὐεργεσίας μεγάλας, ὥστε ἀποθανόντος αὐτοῦ πόθον ἔχειν πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ παρὲξ αὐτῶν Περσέων [cf. Spiegel, Keilinschr.^{2} 88–89].

parābara: Since we have the indicative, an *actual* result is stated, as was rightly seen by Foy, KZ. XXXIII 423 seq., and Müller, WZKM. III 147, as against Kern, Spiegel, and WB. Oppert's rendering, JA., 4. sér., XVII 404, is right as regards the indicative, but he errs, in my judgment, in not making *yaθā* the relative of *avaθā*. He thus translates: "Je l'ai arrangé par la volonté d'Ormazd comme ç'avait été avant moi, lorsque Gaumatès le Mage n'avait pas usurpé (notre palais) notre pays."

[Since these lines were first written an able article by Justi has appeared, ZDMG. LIII 89–92, in answer to Foy's criticism, ibid. LII 592, of his rendering of this difficult §14 in the Grundriss der iran. Philol. II 426–427. Professor Justi reads *abāčariš* (Skt. *sabhācará*), which he renders by 'des Volkes Versammlung.' He further regards *gaiθā* as referring to 'the possessions of the nobility,' while *viθibiš* seems to have a dativa l force. It is especially pleasing to see that he too considers *abāčariš gaiθāmčā māniyamčā* as collective singulars. This last word he compares with the Greek οἰκεῖος in the sense of οἰκέτης, οἰκεύς, as I had already sought to trace an analogous development of meaning between *viθibiš* and οἰκεία· ἰδία.]

§15, *lines 71–72.* Saith Darius the king: This [is] what I did after that I became king.

§16, *lines 72–81.* Saith Darius the king: When I killed Gaumāta the Magian, afterward a man, Āθ^{r}ina by name, the son of Umpadaranma, he arose in Susiana. To the people he said thus: I am king in Susiana. Afterward Susiana became confederate. It went over to that Āθ^{r}ina. He became king in Susiana. And a man, a Babylonian, Nidintubel by name, the son of Aniri, he arose at Babylon. The people he deceived thus: I am Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabûnâ'id. Afterward the Babylonian people all went over to that Nidintubel. Babylon became confederate. He seized the kingdom in Babylon.

§17, *lines 81–83.* Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Susiana. That Āθ^{r}ina was brought bound unto me. I killed him.

§18, *lines 83–90.* Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Babylon against that Nidintubel, who called himself Nebuchadrezzar. The army of Nidintubel held the Tigris. There it stood and hardby (?) was a fleet (?). Afterward I divided the army in two halves (?). The one I made archers (?), for the other I provided horses. Ormazd brought me help. By the grace of Ormazd we crossed the Tigris. Afterward there I killed at will the army of Nidintubel. Of the month Āθ^{r}iyādiya twenty-six days were in course. Then we made battle.

abiš: For this word I can offer no better explanation than to consider it an adverb [so already Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 237]. For the -*š* we must compare Anc. Pers. *patiy* with *patiš*, Sk. *mithū* with *mithus*, Gk. *ἀμφί* with *ἀμφίς*, *ἀντικρύ* with *ἀντικρύς* [for further examples see Schmidt, Pluralb. 359 seq., and cf. Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, I 75 seq.].

nāviyā: The sense forbids us to consider this the loc. sg. +*ā*. Kern's abstract formation to *nāv* is perhaps the best view. Müller, WZKM. XI 252, makes precisely the same explanation, which is far better than his former rendering, WZKM. I 221, 'und dabei waren Schiffe' [cf. Bartholomae, BB. XIV 242, and Foy, KZ. XXXV 35].

madyakāuvā avākanam: So WB. Spiegel, *-makāuvā avākanam.* Rawlinson, *-m . . (?) kāuwá aw (?) kanam* [cf. his 'Notes on the Text,' xliv seq.]. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, *kamakāuvā* 'portiunculas.' Kern, *amakāuvā*. He

compares the Gk. *ἀμίς* (which usually signifies *matella*), and refers for the meaning to Aischylos, Supplices 811:

σοῦσθε, σοῦσθ' ὀλύμεναι ὀλόμεν' ἑπαμίδα.

Müller, WZKM. I 220, reads (*da*)*makāuvā avākanam*, but his translation 'Erdhäuschen' [√*dam* 'build'] is rather strained. Later, WZKM. XI 252, Müller proposes *ramakāuvā* 'in troops' and compares Pahl. *ramak*, New Pers. رمه. This is very good. Foy suggests *ardakāuvā avākarnam*. The only clue to the meaning that we have is the following *aniyam . . . aniyahyā*. I follow Foy in comparing with *arda-* the Ossetic *ardäg*, *ärdäg* 'half,' Sk. *ardhaka* [Apte, Sk.-Eng. Dict. 169; cf. Böhtlingk-Roth, VII, Sp. 1703], Av. *ar°δa*, but his *avakarnam*<**avakr̥n̥'nam* is a little dubious, in spite of the weighty authority of Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 74. The copy of Rawlinson shows that eleven letters are damaged in this place between *kāram* and *-nam*. If we read *ardakaya*, loc. du. (cf. Av. forms like *zastayō*), and take the simple verb of Foy's *avākarnam*, we fill the gap exactly, having in *ardakaya akarnam* ten letters plus one space for the wedge of separation. Foy's explanation of *ardakāuvā*, KZ. XXXV 35, is not altogether convincing to me.

ušabārim: WB. Spiegel reads *dašabārim*, after Rawlinson and Benfey. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, preferred *usabārim . . . açam*. For numerous older interpretations and views see Spiegel, Keilinschr.[2] 92–93. Müller had two suggestions. The first, WZKM. I 220, was a comparison of Xenophon's Anabasis and the reading of *ašabārim*, where *ša* was to correspond to the Greek *ἀσκός*. Later, WZKM. XI 252 seq., Müller changed his reading to *maišabārim*, and he compared Skt. *mēṣa*, Lith. *maišas*, Old Church Slav. *mēχъ* 'hide.' Tolman, Transact. Wisconsin Acad. VIII 244, returns to the old reading *daša°* and renders: 'One (army) I made submissive' (i. e. bearing my right hand). Rugarli does not attempt to translate the crux.

My own suggestion is to read for the (*u*)*ša-bārim* of WB. and Rawlinson's *daša-barim išu-bārim*. This I would render: 'one part I made archers' (cf. Skt. *iṣubhṛt*, which has this same signification). A division of the army into archers and cavalry would be very natural, especially in view of the importance of the former arm of the service (cf. Jackson, Herodotus, vii. 61, or Ancient Persian Armour, in Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler, particularly 100, 111–114). The objection may

be alleged that the *u* in *išu°* is not found in the text. If, however, my reading *avājata* in §10 be accepted, a parallel instance of the complete omission of a letter is at hand.

A purely etymological reading *iša-bārim* would do no violence to the text. This might be rendered 'borne by swift (chariots),' which would give tolerable sense. For the semasiology of **iša* 'chariot' from √*iš* 'to hasten' one might compare Latin *currus* from *curro*, and for the passive sense of *bāri* the Ancient Persian *asabāri* 'horse-borne, knight.' This suggestion of *išabāri* I regard as much inferior to that of *išubāri*.[1]

[Prof. Jackson suggests that WB.'s reading *uša-bārim* should be retained. He would render the word 'borne by oxen,' with a comparison of Skt. *ukṣan*, Av. *uxšan*. For this instance of Anc. Pers. *š* = Indog. *k̂s* we may perhaps compare Anc. Pers. *ustašana* (Art. Pers. a 29) beside *hamataxšaiy*, Bh. i. 68, 70, and *hamataxšatā*, Bh. iv. 65, 82. For the passive sense of *-bāri*, Anc. Pers. *asabāri* is to be compared. I have regarded Darius as lining up his forces for battle in this paragraph of the inscription, while Prof. Jackson thinks that the king is furnishing transportation across the Tigris for his troops. Prof. Jackson makes this suggestion with some hesitation, being fully aware of objections which he thinks may be alleged against it; but it has, in my judgment, much in its favor.]

as[*pā*]: WB. This seems to me to be the only tenable reading. Müller's reading, WZKM. I 222, XI 253, *tašma*(*kam*) *anayam* 'Flossbrücke,' from the root *taxš*, is fatally deficient as regards phonology. On the double form *aspa* and *asa* see above, under my discussion of *sp* in Ancient Persian.

§**19**, *lines 90–96*. Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Babylon. When I had not come to Babylon, there is a place, Zazāna by name, on the Euphrates. There that Nidintubel, who called himself Nebuchadrezzar, went against me with an army to make battle. Afterward we made battle. Ormazd brought me help. By the grace of Ormazd I killed the army of Nidintubel at will. The enemy plunged (?) in the water. The water bore him away. Of the month Anāmaka two days were in course. Then we made battle.

[1] I scarcely think that the similarity in form of the New Sus. *Anšu-a-ab-ba*^{id} and *Anšu-kur-ra*^{id} 'camel' and 'horse' (Weisbach, so also Foy, ZDMG. LII 593) can be any support of a rendering by 'chariot-borne' of *iša-bārim* (!).

[*a*]*hą*[*jat*]*ā*: While the meaning is tolerably clear, the text is very corrupt. WB.'s reading here must be connected with the Skt. root *sañj* 'hang.' Bartholomae, AF. I 61, took *āpiyā* as an instrumental and read as his verb-form *ahadatā* = Skt. *asahata* 'was overpowered by the water.' Foy, KZ. XXXV 36, would return to the reading of Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 239, *āhyatā* from √*ah* 'throw.' Müller, WZKM. I 222, suggested *aharpatā* (cf. Skt. √*sarp*), but this gives six letters when only five are allowed us in the lacuna in the inscription itself. Oppert's reading of *aharatā* (Skt. √*sar*), Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, 'in aquam fugit,' is exceedingly good, in my judgment. Either this *aharatā* or the *āhyatā* of Kern and Foy (adopted also by Rugarli, "il nemico fu gettato nell' acqua") is to be adopted. The New Sus. has here *puttana* 1. sg. aor. caus. to the root *pu* 'go,' cf. Foy, ZDMG. LII 580. The New Susian and the Ancient Persian do not, therefore, literally correspond here, Oppert, loc. cit.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY. LOUIS H. GRAY.